

# **LETTER FROM THE MAN OUTSIDE**

Written by Kevin Galalae in the city of Strasbourg, France, after 14 days of hunger strike.

This is the second letter addressed to Mr. Hammarberg. The first was released after 7 days of hunger strike and is available at Cryptome (<http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae.htm>.) and WikiSpooks ([https://wikispooks.com/wiki/File:Kevin\\_Galalae%27s\\_hunger\\_strike\\_appeal\\_letter.pdf](https://wikispooks.com/wiki/File:Kevin_Galalae%27s_hunger_strike_appeal_letter.pdf).)

25 April 2011.

People of the world,  
Commissioner Hammarberg,

Two weeks have gone by since I first knocked on Commissioner Hammarberg's door – figuratively speaking since he is hidden behind layers and layers of bulletproof glass, concrete walls and security; imprisoned, so to say, in an ivory tower. After 14 days of hunger strike I am 33 pounds (=15kg) lighter, having lost 14% of my body weight, but one hundred times more determined to see to it that I succeed in shutting down the covert program of discrimination, thought control and intimidation that Europe has secretly adopted in 2010 as part of the Stockholm Programme and that I have baptized by the acronym SAC.

There are occasional dizzy spells and weakness, a constantly dry mouth and at times blurry vision, but otherwise I am in good shape and hunger is entirely absent having shut down the need to eat and the desire for food. The minibar in my hotel room has a box of peanuts and three cans of pop. On any given day I would have devoured them all within a few hours, but even though I have only had water in the first 10 days and some juice in the last 4 days, I have not even been tempted to sneak a bite or a sip. On the contrary, the items remain on their shelves to warn me when my will, my angels, or my God (you have your pick) have abandoned me.

So if you are counting on me to give up and go home, Mr. Hammarberg, your calculation is wrong.

#### THE PEOPLE'S LAST LINE OF DEFENSE OR THE ESTABLISHMENT'S FIRST LINE OF DECEIT?

---

The Human Rights Commissioner's continuing silence on what should be a clear-cut case of gross violations of the European Convention and international law proves beyond a reasonable doubt that SAC is vital to the success of a hidden agenda, an agenda that has nothing to do with counter-radicalization or combating terrorism and that he is either powerless or afraid to denounce it.

Logic dictates that a covert programme that has been blown open is of no use anymore if its intended purpose was to prevent young people from becoming terrorists by subjecting them to covert surveillance in universities. I therefore thank the Commissioner for confirming to the public that there is far more to SAC than what meets the eye. SAC is in fact so crucial that no amount of human suffering will compel the global nexus of power that is behind the counter-radicalization lie to give up this new tool of thought control.

Every pound of flesh I lost during the two weeks since I have started my hunger strike confirms also that Commissioner Hammarberg is not doing his duty, which is to ensure that the EU member states act in accordance with the human rights they profess to treasure and respect. I remind you, Commissioner, that your function is to be the people's last line of defense. There is still time to show that you are the people's last line of defense and not the establishment's first line of deception. I hope you will be using this time wisely.

Easter weekend has just gone by and I hope Commissioner that it was a happy time for you and your family. I certainly could not be with mine.

The UN Security Council's conference that took place here in Strasbourg last week has also come to an end on April 21. The fact that the officials in charge of the counter-radicalization strategy have not condemned SAC, even though they were in Strasbourg to assess their policies and progress, is also an indication that it is too important to give up because it is critical to the entire counter-radicalization deception, a deception that I shall fully expose in this letter.

Abandoning SAC would be an admission that the UN's safeguards put in place to protect human rights and the rule of law from abuse do not work, opening them up to unprecedented legal liabilities. The UN's refusal to admit this shows also that there is no accountability for mistakes made and crimes committed under the cover of counter-radicalization.

The high officials in charge of the programme at the UN level cannot say that they did not know, for I have personally tracked down six of them<sup>1</sup> at the Holiday Inn Hotel Strasbourg and hand-delivered envelopes to each of them containing both my hunger strike pamphlet and a copy of the first letter I sent Mr. Hammarberg. The high officials were therefore fully aware.

On the morning of the first day of the conference, Mr. Puri, who is the Chair of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, walked by me with an entourage of four men and as I tried to give him another pamphlet he grumbled that he had already read it. His face was as crimson as his turban.<sup>2</sup> That is not because he was angry to see me, but because in the letter I enclosed in his envelope I explained that the largest ethnic group that reaches the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) with complaints unresolved at the university level is Indian, that is, his fellow nationals.<sup>3</sup> I am sure he had a few words to say to the British representatives and that they were not kind.

---

## SAC AND COUNTER-RADICALIZATION IN GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

---

In my last letter, I explained the damage SAC does to young and innocent lives and to democracies in Europe and throughout the Western world. In this letter, I will put the current counter-radicalization policy and its deformed child, SAC, in perspective and in so doing show that they are not what we are led to believe. You, Mr. Hammarberg, of course already know this since you are a party to it, but I have to be explicit for the benefit of my readers since this letter, like the last one, will be posted on the Internet as soon as you get it.

The counter-radicalization strategy is part of the greater struggle against terrorism, which is delegated from the UN by the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) since 2001. The CTC's job is to bolster the ability of UN Member States to prevent terrorist acts both within and outside their borders and is assisted in its work by the Counter-Terrorism Committee

---

<sup>1</sup> The high officials in question are: Hardeep Singh Puri, Chair of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC); Mike Smith, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED); Edward Flynn (CTED); Ahmed Seif El-Dawla (CTED); Zeeshan Amin, Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force; and Syed Haider Shah (CTED).

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Suri is a Sikh.

<sup>3</sup> For details see p. 61 at: <http://www.oiahe.org.uk/downloads/OIA-annual-report-2009.pdf>.

Executive Directorate (CTED), which carries out the policy decisions of the CTC, conducts expert assessments of each Member State and facilitates technical assistance.

The CTC is guided by three Security Council resolutions: 1373 (adopted in 2001), 1624 (adopted in 2005) and 1963 (adopted in 2010). The counter-radicalization strategy was born in 2005 with resolution 1624. Not surprisingly, it was drafted by the United Kingdom<sup>4</sup> and calls upon Member States to, among other things, adopt measures necessary to countering incitement of terrorist acts motivated by extremism and intolerance, prevention of subversion of educational, cultural and religious institutions. In other words, everything one needs to institute a covert programme like SAC and to infiltrate not only universities but also places of worship and cultural institutions.

Knowing that 1624 would have a devastating effect on human rights and especially on freedom of expression, association and religion, the preamble to the resolution starts by reaffirming the Council's will to combat terrorism in accordance with the United Nations Charter and to use measures that conform to international law; a clear indication that this would not happen. The resolution also emphasizes efforts for dialogue to broaden understanding among civilizations to prevent any indiscriminate targeting of religions and cultures; once again knowing full well that deeper divisions between civilizations and the indiscriminate targeting of religions and cultures are to be expected and unavoidable once such measures and the extraordinary powers to carry them out are let loose on the world.

To cover up the human rights violations and the cultural divisions that the drafters of resolution 1624 knew would inevitably ensue, they called upon the media, business and society to *promote tolerance*, which in the twisted jargon of diplomacy means suppress all cases and incidents of intolerance and abuse caused by the resolution and remain blind and deaf to any victims who cry for help. The United Kingdom, in other words, set the stage for unencumbered state-sponsored discrimination at home and abroad and arm twisted every Member State to cooperate both in a conspiracy of silence and in undermining their own nations' democratic processes and independence.

Despite its obvious incompatibility with human rights and civil liberties, resolution 1624 was unanimously adopted because it offered a priceless gift, a license to suppress dissent. The gift that every government took home was the ability to commit any crimes at home against anyone and then label the victims extremists and terrorists to avoid being held accountable in the courts or exposed and criticized in the local or international press. That is a mighty gift that no one in power can refuse and that oppressive governments far and wide now use to counter insurgencies and to nip in the bud any legitimate dissent. The impact to democracy and to democratic aspirations is greater than anyone can know and it will take decades to reveal and great suffering and hardship to reverse.

\*

---

<sup>4</sup> The covert programme of **surveillance and censorship (SAC)** against which I am currently on hunger strike was, I remind the reader, conceived in the United Kingdom and in use there since 2007, before being approved for replication by the EU in late 2009 through the back door of the Stockholm Programme. It is very revealing to note that as Britain was setting the stage at the UN and getting legal cover for violating the expressional, privacy and conscience rights of any foreigner studying in British universities and regardless whether online, from their home countries, or onsite, it also adopted the **Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005** at home to give itself legal and political permission to commit even greater breeches of human rights and civil liberties.

Having gotten what it wanted from the UN, the UK then set to work and repackaged its 2003 counter-terrorism strategy, putting out a revised version in 2007 and then again in 2009<sup>5</sup>.

The new CONTEST strategy, the Home Secretary, Jacqui Smith, boasts in the 2009 introduction, “*is one of the most comprehensive and wide-ranging approaches to tackling terrorism anywhere in the world*”. That indeed it is, but what we are not told is that it is also thoroughly unlawful and dangerously unethical. It has four strands: Pursue, Prevent, Protect, Prepare, and it is within the *Prevent* strand that counter-radicalization is introduced as a way to stop people from becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism.

To achieve the miracle of identifying terrorists in the making, the government gave their secret service agencies broad powers to engage in covert surveillance and interception of communications. That is how universities became infiltrated by secret service agents and how SAC came to be.

\*

In parallel to the UK, the EU began formulating its own counter-radicalization strategy as early as September 2005 when it issued the “*Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council Concerning Terrorist Recruitment: Addressing the Factors Contributing to Violent Radicalization*”. The EU’s strategy at that time, however, relies on education, integration, economic support and law enforcement rather than covert surveillance and interception of communications. The removal of websites that promote violence is as far as the EU is willing to go in 2005.

By the end of 2005, the EU adopted the British four-pronged approach to combating terrorism, but not necessarily the same controversial and unlawful methods, leaving implementation up to the individual member states.<sup>6</sup> It also put the Prevent strand first, followed by the Protect, Pursue, and Respond. That the EU chooses to describe its fourth strand with the word *Respond*, as opposed to the word *Prepare* used by the British, is merely semantics and therefore of no relevance. Of more importance is the order chosen in the EU version, which indicates that the main priority is on *protecting* the populace, whereas the UK’s is on *pursuing* terrorists.

Despite the changed order and the implied difference in priorities, it is clear that since the end of 2005 the UK already sets the tone in Europe as far as counter-terrorism and counter-radicalization are concerned. It is also clear that the UK wants to be the darling of the US and is staying as close as possible to America’s aggressive pursuit of terrorists; a desire clearly expressed in a US cable whose tone is embarrassingly servile. (09LONDON2768, available at: [http://wikileaksnoir.blogg.no/1292086801\\_viewing\\_cable\\_09londo.html](http://wikileaksnoir.blogg.no/1292086801_viewing_cable_09londo.html)).

At Britain’s request, the US and the UK begin holding weekly videoconferences to coordinate ever closer their counter-radicalization plans and actions. We are now at the inner sanctum of the counter-radicalization effort. This is revealed in cable 09LONDON1933 (available at: <http://www.wikileaks.ch/cable/2009/08/09LONDON1933.html>).

---

<sup>5</sup> The document is entitled “CONTEST: *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism*”

<sup>6</sup> The EU’s policy document is entitled: “The European Union Counter-Terrorism Strategy: Prevent, Protect, Pursue, Respond” (30 November 2005).

That the EU strategy is a copy of the UK strategy (minus the cowboy attitude) is reflected in the language used by the EU document and that copies that of the UK, as for instance when it says: “we need to ensure that voices of **mainstream** opinion prevail over those of extremism by engaging with civil society and faith groups”. (p. 8) I have highlighted the word ‘mainstream’ because its choice is very deliberate and the result of close and exclusive consultations between the UK and the US.

This comes out in an October 2007 US cable (07LONDON4045, available at: <http://wikileaks.ch/cable/2007/10/07LONDON4045.html>.) between a British high official, EUR Senior Advisor for Muslim Engagement Farah Pandith, and a U.S. Department of State official, S/P Member Jared Cohen, in which the former explains:

*“HMG is currently working on an updated strategy, yet to be blessed by ministers, to update and improve its approach to stopping terrorists and extremists...One project currently underway is preparation of a paper on what language works best in public outreach, Lowen said; for example, the advantage of using the word “mainstream” to define common values, as opposed to “the West”, which can have negative connotations.”*

‘Mainstream’ is a euphemism for ‘Western’ and the British conception of what counter-radicalization should achieve is the imposition of western values on non-western people. I do not know if the US has bitten the poisoned apple the Brits have tempted it with<sup>7</sup>, but if it has the country does not have long before it implodes under sectarian and religious strife. America, unlike Britain, is a country of immigrants and though a melting pot it cannot hope to social-engineer society through oppressive methods. What the US has agreed to do, however, is to give Britain the cover it needs to carry out its plan.

Back in Europe, between 2005 and 2009, the UK used its considerable soft power to good effect, exerting influence through the dominance it has over EU institutions, and appears to have persuaded the EU Member States to adopt the same controversial and unlawful methods of counter-radicalization as Britain through the *Stockholm Programme*, which contains guidelines of common policy – including cooperation in the areas of police, military and secret services – for the EU Member States for the years 2010 through 2015.<sup>8</sup> There is all indication that Europe has bitten Britain’s poisoned apple.

## THE HIDDEN ANGLO-SAXON OBJECTIVES BEHIND SAC AND COUNTER-RADICALIZATION

---

One must ask, how did the UK succeed in corrupting the EU’s commitment to human rights and respect for the law in the fight against terrorism when there have been no major terrorism acts since 2005 and no reasons to strengthen the existing tools of combating terrorism? I have already mentioned the UK’s dominance of EU institutions, but in addition to this the UK has used its ability to deceive. Before I show the reader how, I should mention that continental Europeans would not have been difficult to blind. All the UK needed to do to get the

---

<sup>7</sup> I will continue to look for evidence in the US embassy cables released by WikiLeaks.

<sup>8</sup> How I come to this conclusion is explained in detail in my paper, “*The Great Secret: Surveillance and Censorship in Britain and the EU*”, available at Cryptome and WikiSpooks. pp. 11-13.

Europeans to eat out of their hands was to let them glimpse and drool over at the hidden potential of counter-radicalization conducted through programmes like SAC, and the success they achieved at suppressing minority views, controlling the media, taming the courts, and manufacturing consent where there is none. Let me explain.

While the unsophisticated technocrats and politicians of the EU and its Member States were swept off their feet at the repressive potential of CR<sup>9</sup> British style, the UK and the US are pursuing geopolitical objectives of far greater importance and that promise rich rewards.

In the era of openness and of easy access to information that we live in, hidden interests can only be advanced through hidden means. A policy that is to serve its masters must have multiple facets. Counter-radicalization has three faces: a public, a confidential and a secret face, and SAC lies hidden behind the secret face. This deception is not uncommon and necessary in order to avoid public resistance and to advance the interests of those who govern, interests that are often but not always antithetical to democracy, to the wellbeing of the masses and to the greater good.

In the case of SAC and the counter-radicalization policy, the public face, which is only for public consumption, is to protect the populace from terrorists and ensure national security. The confidential face, which is shared with select parties in the corridors of power at the EU and the UN, counter-radicalization is sold as the best way to promote a culture of peace, ensure global security and stability while at the same time giving collaborating governments a tool to ignore their people's legitimate grievances and the green light to fight internal dissent and political opposition.

On the EU level, as I have stated before, this new security architecture allows individual governments and Brussels to misuse and abuse the instruments introduced for the purpose of counter-radicalization to quell legitimate social protests and to pursue social engineering goals without constitutional restrictions and despite grassroots opposition.

The third face, the secret face, is for the inner circle only, the close allies, and in the case of SAC the objective is to render alternative political views, dissenting voices, minority interests and the common man voiceless by denying them the ability to exchange ideas and organize in order to sway public opinion, obtain political representation and shape the society they live in. SAC allows the so-called free world to police thought for the benefit of its elites while continuing to pretend to be free, fair and equal societies.

Ultimately, this kind of thought control allows the global power structure to declare that there is consensus where there is none. While this is necessary to overcome those deeply ingrained social, cultural and religious relics that ill-fit the New World Order and indeed often stand in the way of necessary progress, a lot more gets dragged and drowned by this giant net that now pulls the world forward kicking and screaming towards global tyranny.

The counter-radicalization strategy, therefore, has three manifestations: a protective, a preventive, and a manipulative one. In its last manifestation, its ultimate goal is to ensure that the only worldview left standing at the end of the day is the Western worldview and that along with this great sweep all other identities, including national identities, are erased off the face of the earth so that the people of the world, regardless of their traditions, can be subsumed in one and ultimate global nation, which is the end goal of the New World Order.

---

<sup>9</sup> I will henceforth occasionally use the abbreviation CR for counter-radicalization.

While the goal of a borderless world is a noble one, and I support it fully, too much gets lost in this stampede towards the New World Order, because the pace and the means by which it is pursued are wrong.

## WHAT HAS BEEN DESTROYED<sup>10</sup>

---

Let me now point out what has been destroyed. Most importantly, people no longer matter. What matters is the integrity of the system and the unquestioned authority of the superstructure of control. People everywhere are being bullied, manipulated, strong-armed, ignored and overridden.

The institutional power balance necessary to catch and to address injustice and breaches is also gone. The global nexus of power now has the ability to deprive citizens of their rights and liberties without having to justify its actions and without permission or repercussions.

The responsibility and freedom to follow one's conscience have been taken away from every human being on earth in positions of power or importance. This completes the infrastructure of absolute control and now that it is in place all it needs is to be fully activated. If it falls in the wrong hands, mankind will then succumb to its darkest age yet and from which there will be no escape because the system of control is now global and centralized. This will render humankind prisoners to a system that has no conscience and no compassion.

The independence of people to choose for themselves the kind of society they want and to self-determine the nature of their government is also lost. The people already in power no longer act in accordance with the will of the people; they await orders from the global nexus of power.

The elites and the institutions and organizations they lead have been turned into tentacles of the New World Order and are now controlled from a single centre of power, the US via the UN. Though delegated from the US the nexus of power has no nationality. It comprises the elites of the globe and has nothing to do with the American people, who have long lost control of their country's governing structures.

The rule of law has been annihilated and replaced by the decisions of the global nexus of power, made up of select individuals who are far above the law and whose worse nightmare is a world in which all men are equal under the law and in charge of their own lives. In their New World Order man's free will has but a 2m radius. We have all been turned into peons who live in illusory freedom at the mercy of their system's needs.

I contend that what has been destroyed is too precious and too vital to give up. These vital and precious features of freedom and democracy have been lost because the New World Order is being pursued from the top down, when it ought to be pursued from the bottom and

---

<sup>10</sup> I have just received news that my older brother, who lives in Kiel, Germany, has received a visit from the police, informing him of my hunger strike. It appears that the police have then asked my brother to persuade me to give up my hunger strike in an email sent from a protected email address. This can only mean that the EU authorities are about to force me out of the country or find alternative ways to stop me from continuing my hunger strike. This being the case, I am rushing this essay through and I ask for understanding for the loss in quality and for being choppy.



the top at the same time and at a pace that allows the common man to embrace it and the emerging worldview to be a cross-cultural hybrid and not a Western imposition.

## COUNTER-RADICALIZATION IS MERELY A FAÇADE FOR RESISTANCE TO AND RETALIATION AGAINST GLOBAL CAPITALISM

---

The part that SAC plays in the task of entrenching global control is to force every graduate to conform to the policies of the status quo and not to challenge the viability of the New World Order, which is nothing more than corporate capitalism imposed on all and in every corner of the world. They want to ensure that every graduate stays on message, and since the US and the UK educate the vast majority of the world's foreign students and their graduates already overwhelm the world's international organizations, the Anglo-American dominant soft power will be perpetuated and further entrenched.

SAC, therefore, is not for counter-radicalization but for counter-resistance and counter-retaliation; resistance and retaliation to the imposition of global capitalism. SAC is pure and simple class warfare. That is why it is defended at all costs and across the establishment.

SAC is merely one of many measures adopted under the cover of counter-terrorism and counter-radicalization. Other programmes are directed at other segments of the population. But given the central role education plays in accessing positions of influence in this world of acute credentialism we live in, SAC is the jewel in the crown of the counter-resistance plot.

Why is this plot necessary? To quell the increasing resistance to growing inequalities and inequities and the gap between those inside the power establishment and the people who are outside of it. The two camps have lost common ground as soon as capital was allowed to go global while people were imprisoned in nation-states.

Every facet of the counter-radicalization policy is designed to create divisions. Divide and conquer is after all the oldest method of control. The public face of counter-radicalization merely enforces the natural division that exists between the peaceful and the violent, but also greatly deepens the divisions between Christians and Muslims.

The confidential face divides the people in positions of influence (newspaper editors, university chancellors, directors of NGOs, etc.) from the populace under the pretext that this is necessary to preserve the integrity and covert nature of the entire program, on which the security of the world depends, so they are told.

And the secret face divides everyone from everyone by creating fear and suspicion, leaving society fragmented and incapable of hanging on to the existing national institutions, institutions that can only be built on trust, respect, integrity and continuous dialogue between the people and their leaders. That dialogue is severed because counter-radicalization's secret and most important objective is to shift the loyalty of the political class from their people to the global nexus of power, which is intent on taking corporate capitalism global at whatever the cost.

As it divides everyone below, the CR deception bands together the world's political elites to contribute their efforts and declare their loyalty to the New Global Order regardless of whether what they are asked to do is good for their nations and sanctioned by their people.

Nations thus weakened from the top and divided at the bottom are then easily submerged in the global framework of the New World Order.

Why do I say this with such certainty? Because counter-radicalization cannot possibly work the way it is presumably intended. The effect of counter-radicalization is the opposite, for when the State censors a person for his or her deeply felt opinions and values and intrudes in people's lives and inner sphere with surveillance it only exacerbates the lines of division, the result being humiliation and embitterment, which only "radicalizes" a person thus persecuted. When this kind of treatment is meted on an entire group of people who share the same cultural characteristics and who are held together by group cohesion and traditions, the effect is oppression on a grand scale and the withdrawal of that group within itself.

Minorities thus treated will form ghettos to escape the regime of oppression imposed on them as best they can, or they will leave the country, which is apparently already happening in Western Europe. They will also be suspicious of anyone outside the group and will defend their honor, rights, and group cohesion by becoming antagonistic to the greater culture in which they are an island and the subject of constant suspicion.

When every opinion expressed and every action taken is weighed and measured by the prying eye of the State, life becomes unbearable. When innocent, honest and decent people are further persecuted and deprived of their fundamental rights and liberties for freely expressing their views and feelings life becomes unbearable. The entire counter-radicalization programme, judged by the objectives of its public face, is therefore flawed and fraudulent. That it does more harm than good has already been observed by insiders. In cable 09LONDON33 (available at: <http://wikileaks.ste.no/cable/2009/01/09LONDON33.html>), Polloffs, a US official, asks Manley, his British counterpart, "*whether doing nothing would have been better*".

The answer is self-evident, but CR programmes continue to expand and to violate evermore fundamental rights of evermore people. That is the case because a new industry has been created, the counter-radicalization industry, which employs hundreds of thousands of people worldwide and is the world's best funded industry supported by public money.

Three years after Polloffs has asked his astute question, the counter-radicalization industry is stronger and larger than ever before. Untold amounts of money and human resources are being poured into it and wasted on a global initiative that cannot produce its stated goals and that has caused perhaps irreparable damage to the world's democracies and to those aspiring for freedom.

---

#### THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF ABSOLUTE CONTROL IS NOW IN PLACE

---

In the absence of a counter-force to capitalism, now that Islam and the world's 1.5 billion Muslims has been made irrelevant and China has long been turned into a capitalist one-party state, the world is now fully at the mercy of corporate capitalism's predatory and abusive ways. The counter-radicalization industry has therefore achieved its true goal.

While I do not believe the nexus of power at the helm of the New World Order to be evil or ill-intentioned, it is clear that it is willing – and now thanks to the architecture of control

imposed under the banner of fighting terrorism and radicalization also able – to achieve its objectives by heartless and unlawful means.

The global nexus of power does not seek the public's consent, it circumvents it. It does this to achieve goals that meet with broad opposition but that need to be achieved.

The New World Order they have created has many good features and many shortcomings:

1. a global orientation, though not yet a global consciousness or equal respect for the world's people
2. the freedom of capital to operate without borders, but not that of labor to seek opportunity beyond borders
3. it is without religion, but not yet ethical
4. makes nations obsolete, but is not democratic
5. it puts global resources to good use, but it does not distribute them properly or fairly
6. it uses global differences and inequalities to create efficiencies, but it does not consider the interests of labor, just those of capital
7. it concentrates wealth to better transfer it to the developing world, but it has failed to deliver even the promised trickle-down prosperity
8. it creates and enforces universal rules of engagement for trade, finance, and industry, but does not apply them equally

Because the New World Order is failing on so many fronts – and it is failing because it is divorced from democratic processes – it is destabilizing both the developed and the developing world at once. But its greatest failing is that it has abandoned the weak, the poor and the foreign, which nowadays includes the majority of the world's population, and that in fact it seeks to achieve its grand geopolitical objectives in the full knowledge that it cannot and will not include them in the circle of economic security.

In all fairness, the global nexus of power is trying its best, but they are working with an intractable world. Europeans are too prejudiced to open their doors to non-Europeans and to the world; Asians are too submissive to their old systems of authority; Africans are too underdeveloped and undisciplined; Middle Easterners are too intolerant of other people and of change; South Americans are seeking refuge from the hardships of competition in socialism; and North Americans operate from the false premise that what is good for them is good for the world.

I am not after destroying this New World Order, but after keeping it human by subjecting it to the only balance that can do this, that of the people versus the elites. The people want a place at the table. The world needs the people to have a place at the table, because the people and their cries need to be heard and answered and that is no longer the case.

What the New World Order needs in order to succeed where it has failed is to be overseen by an assembly of popularly elected individuals representing every country on earth. This assembly of globally elected representatives must have the power to overturn any and all decisions or measures taken by the global nexus of power.

The reason the New World Order is being sheltered from democratic control is because those who devised it believe it is still a fragile child, a work in progress that needs to be protected from the common man's lack of understanding who in his ignorance will never approve of it.

I believe this is a misguided approach. The people need to be explained and let in on the big plan. When that is properly done, even the most dimwitted bigot will readily offer his help.

Why does it need to be protected? Because a lot more capital needs to be transferred from the rich to the poor world in order to begin to equalize wealth; because borders need to be eliminated to facilitate the free movement of labor and enable the elimination of any and all protectionist tariffs and trade barriers; because education has yet to inculcate the global consciousness needed to create a world with a common purpose; and because infrastructure is underdeveloped and conflict haunts the world.

\*

I have always been an avid promoter of a world without borders, but not if it means the tyranny of the rich and powerful of this world over mankind, achieved and sustained by extinguishing men's thoughts before they leave their lips, thus by destroying freewill and the desire and ability for self-determination.

Worse yet, by shutting down the channels of peaceful redress through legal means for injuries done by the State, or States in this case, those who protect SAC, and programmes like it that already span or will soon span the globe, are paving the way for violence on an unprecedented scale, violence being the only option left to save justice and freedom.

What they are achieving through their reckless counter-radicalization policy and measures is not global peace and security but universal control and with it the power to exploit the world's people at will.

Forcing students to self-censor their thoughts in order to graduate will not produce the thinkers and the moral men the world needs to advance. It will only produce half-educated sycophants who will not deviate from the orders that come from above, regardless how abject and flawed they may be; graduates who instead of standing on the shoulders of giants merely hide in their shadows.

Many of my relatives and friends have said that I should return home to my family, but that would mean capitulating to a system of absolute control and that I cannot and will not do. Living with such disregard for the wider world and the future would show a complete lack of empathy, conscience and long-term foresight. For regardless how well I will raise and educate my children, they will be destroyed by the system of tyranny that is being build around us and sold as our ticket to salvation.

I remind you, Commissioner Hammarberg, that I am on a hunger strike because I cannot accept living in a Kafkaesque world and because I would not be human if I allowed this system of control to perpetrate its injustices on our children, who do not have the strength or the ability to fight back.

I remind you that you are supposed to be the people's last line of defense, and not the establishment's first line of deception.

I remind you that the age of deception is over. WikiLeaks put a lethal bullet in it and the people will bury it.

The time to act and scrap SAC is now.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae  
The Man Outside

I ask those who read this document to support my struggle by emailing Commissioner Hammarberg and asking him to condemn and shut down SAC. His email address is: [commissioner@coe.int](mailto:commissioner@coe.int). Thank you for your support.